

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
CENTRAL DIVISION**

VALARY WARD

PLAINTIFF

v.

Case No. 4:20-CV-00385-LPR

Case No. 4:20-CV-01436-LPR

ARKANSAS CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL

DEFENDANT

ORDER

On August 18, 2022, the Court granted summary judgment to Arkansas Children’s Hospital.¹ Ms. Ward moved for reconsideration on August 30, 2022.² Essentially, Ms. Ward says the summary-judgment record doesn’t give the true story of the case. It is too late for Ms. Ward to make such arguments. Ms. Ward did not respond to the Hospital’s Motion. And she “utterly failed to comply with the applicable Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure” when she filed her own Motion for Summary Judgment.³ So “the Court accept[ed] the Hospital’s [evidence] as admitted.”⁴ Moreover, a motion for reconsideration based on evidentiary matters is really only appropriate when a party presents “newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered” beforehand.⁵ But that’s not the situation here. Ms. Ward’s Motion for Reconsideration is simply a rehashing of her failed Motion for Summary Judgment.⁶ Accordingly, the Court DENIES Ms. Ward’s Motion for Reconsideration.

¹ 4:20-cv-00385 (Docs. 64 & 65); 4:20-cv-01436 (Docs. 15 & 16).

² 4:20-cv-00385 (Docs. 66 & 67); 4:20-cv-01436 (Doc. 17).

³ 4:20-cv-00385 (Doc. 64) at 2 n.6; 4:20-cv-01436 (Doc. 15) at 2 n.6.

⁴ 4:20-cv-00385 (Doc. 64) at 2 n.6; 4:20-cv-01436 (Doc. 15) at 2 n.6.

⁵ Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(2).

⁶ The exhibits to Ms. Ward’s Motion for Reconsideration are documents from the case docket, primarily from her Motion for Summary Judgment. *See* 4:20-cv-00385 (Doc. 66) at 11–147; 4:20-cv-01436 (Doc. 17) at 11–147.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of December 2022.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lee P. Rudofsky', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

LEE P. RUDOFSKY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE